UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

AKI ENTERTAINMENT, INCORPORATED, Claimant-Appellant,

v. No. 99-1633

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge.
(CA-98-3956-JFM)

Submitted: February 8, 2000

Decided: February 28, 2000

Before TRAXLER and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Terrance G. Reed, Christopher A. Hostage, REED & HOSTAGE, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Lynne A. Battaglia, United States Attorney, Richard C. Kay, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

AKI Entertainment, Inc., appeals from the district court's order dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction AKI's challenge to the Drug Enforcement Administration's intent to forfeit currency seized from its employee, Maceo Delmontrai Belt. AKI asserted that it did not receive notice of the forfeiture. The district court dismissed the action because the administrative forfeiture proceedings were pending.

The district court does not have jurisdiction to address claims of ownership of property during the pendency of administrative forfeiture proceedings. See Ibarra v. United States., 120 F.3d 472, 474-76 (4th Cir. 1997). "[O]nce the administrative forfeiture is completed, district courts retain jurisdiction to review the forfeiture to determine compliance with due process and procedural requirements." Id. at 474 n.4 (emphasis added). Therefore, the district court properly dismissed AKI's claim for lack of jurisdiction. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order dismissing this action. We express no opinion as to the adequacy of the notice of forfeiture given to AKI. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

2